



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/045,616	11/09/2001	Wen-Lian Hsu	08919-063001/05A-880412	1040
26161	7590	04/09/2004	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON PC 225 FRANKLIN ST BOSTON, MA 02110			FERNANDES, CHERYL M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2171	
DATE MAILED: 04/09/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

4

A26

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/045,616	HSU ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Cheryl M Fernandes	2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 May 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 10 May 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                     | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                                  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Abstract***

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of grammatical errors in lines 4,5 and 8. Examiner suggests changing the plural form of 'contents' to 'content' (lines 4 and 5) in order to make the sentence easier to read and the removal of "10126347.doc" (line 8). Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

### ***Drawings***

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: object text 26c missing in Figure 2C (paragraph 25, line 1); Figure 2C does not mention the word 'rainy' as mentioned (page 9, paragraph 34, line 4); Grammatical error – 'Is' should read 'Are'( Figure 5, element 52). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Specification***

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: 'compare' should read 'comparing' (page 4, paragraph 13, lines 4 and 6); 'web sites' should read 'web site' (page 4, paragraph 14, line 2); Figure 2A should read '2B' ( paragraph 30, line

1); Figure 2 should read Figure 2A (page 10, paragraph 36, line 1); Missing opening parenthesis (page 12, paragraph 43, line 7). Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A (1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 19 – 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 19 recites the limitation "the personalized web page" in line 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

For purposes of examination, examiner will assume that the personalized web page is 'a personalized webpage'.

Claims 20-25 depend from claim 19 and therefore inherit the aforesaid deficiency.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10, 11, 13-17, 19, 20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Pat No 5,983,227 issued to Nazem et al. (hereafter Nazem).

**Claims 1, 10 and 19:**

Referring to claim 1, Nazem discloses:

A method of updating a personalized web page, the method comprising:

- identifying characteristic features and an information sample (Figure 2, 'page generator' element 210 and 'user front page template', element 202<sup>1</sup>) from an input that specifies a web site, the web site providing the information sample (column 2, lines 60-63);
- determining corresponding contents of the web site based on the characteristic features (Figure 2, 'page generator' element 210 and 'cached user templates', element 214<sup>2</sup>);

---

<sup>1</sup> Page generator 210 identifies characteristic features in the information sample -user front-page template 202, as user template 202 contains all characteristic features that need to be found in the webpage.

<sup>2</sup> Page generator 210 uses cached user templates 214 in Figure 2 to determine a corresponding template from the cached user template database 214.

- extracting the corresponding contents on the basis of relevancy of the domain keyword, semantic category, event and layout of the corresponding contents to the information sample (Figure 2, 'user front page template', element 202 and 'page generator', element 210<sup>3</sup>);
- and updating the personalized web page with the corresponding contents (Figure 1, 'edit server' element 112; Figure 2<sup>4</sup>).

Referring to claim 19, Nazem discloses a computer program product residing on a computer readable medium with the same limitations as claim 1. Nazem discloses a page server 104 program product including a shared memory for storing live data (Figure 2, element 212).

Referring to claim 10, Nazem discloses a system ('client-server system', Figure 1, element 100) comprising a processor connected to a plurality of websites by a network ('Internet', Figure 1, element 106), the processor having the same limitations of claim 1 including a display for the web page. The Nazem system in lines 43-47 of column 5, disclose that users are able to view custom web pages. The Nazem system could not operate functionally without a display through which users could view the web pages.

Claims 2, 11 and 20:

---

<sup>3</sup> Page generator extracts relevant cached user templates corresponding to the user front-page template 202.

<sup>4</sup> Edit server 112 in Figure 1 updates the personalized webpage with the corresponding cached user templates 214 and shared memory 212 in Figure 2.

Referring to claims 2, 11 and 20, Nazem discloses identifying, determining, extracting and updating at a frequency specified by an input (column 4, lines 43-47), the update frequency depending on how often the user accesses the webpage.

Claims 4, 13:

Referring to claims 4 and 13, Nazem discloses a identifying a topic keyword (column 6, lines 51-59)

Claims 5 and 14:

Referring to claims 5 and 14, Nazem discloses a identifying a layout of the information sample (Figure 3, element 302).

Claims 6 and 15:

Referring to claims 6 and 15, Nazem discloses a identifying a domain keyword of the information sample (column 2, line 67 and column 6, line 57).

Claims 7 and 16:

Referring to claims 7 and 16, Nazem discloses a identifying a semantic category of the information sample (Figure 5A, element 504).

Claims 8 and 17:

Referring to claims 8 and 16, Nazem discloses a identifying an event in the input (Figure 5A, element 504).

Claim 22:

Refer to discussion regarding claims 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 above.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3,12 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nazem as applied to claims 1,2,10 and 19 above, and further in view of Pub Number US 2002/0188503 to Banerjee et al. (hereafter Banerjee).

Claims 3, 12 and 21:

Nazem discloses the elements of claims 1, 2, 10 and 19, as discussed above.

Nazem fails to disclose verification confirming the update and adding the corresponding contents into a training set.

Banerjee shows verification confirming the update and adding the corresponding contents into a training set (pages 2-3, paragraph 21).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Nazem to include verification confirming the update and adding the corresponding contents into a training set as taught by Banerjee.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Nazem per the above for the purpose of maintaining a list of updates so that changes to the database can be tracked wherein the dynamic web pages would merge constantly-updated descriptions of bundles, stored in a database, with a web-page template, on the fly (pages 2-3, paragraph 21).

Claims 9, 18, 23, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nazem as applied to claims 1, 10, 19 and 22 above, and further in view of US Patent Number 6006218 issued to Breese et al. (hereafter Breese).

Claims 9, 18 and 23:

Nazem discloses the elements of claims 1, 10, 19 and 22.

Nazem fails to disclose assigning a score according to the degree of relevancy of the corresponding contents to the information sample.

Breese shows assigning a score according to the degree of relevancy of the corresponding contents to the information (column 13, lines 1-3).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Nazem to include assigning a score according to the degree of relevancy of the corresponding contents to the information sample according to Breese.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Nazem per the above for the purpose of determining the accuracy of a search whereby adjusting ranking values generated by a known search engine as a function of the knowledge probability estimates, the teachings of Breese reduces or eliminates the risk of locating known information near the top of a list of search results. This is advantageous since known information is generally of little interest to a user. In addition, Breese teaches ranking of the search results to give the user an opportunity to have the ranking of the search results accurately reflect the user's knowledge (Abstract).

Claim 24:

Nazem discloses the elements of claims 19, 22 and 23.

Nazem fails to disclose a computer program product that compares the topic keyword and layout of the corresponding contents with those of the information sample to determine the degree of relevancy.

Breese shows a computer program product that compares the topic keyword and layout of the corresponding contents with those of the information sample to determine the degree of relevancy (column 17 line 60 – column 18 line 2).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Nazem to include a computer program product that compares the topic keyword and layout of the corresponding contents with those of the information sample to determine the degree of relevancy according to Breese.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Nazem per the above for the purpose of having a search engine (database) perform a search wherein a keyword is compared to the layout in the database in order to find a result that is most relevant wherein Breese teaches application may be based on using a search engine such as, e.g., a collaborative filter, to process data in a database. For example, the invention of Breese can be used to select data from a database to be included in a personalized electronic newspaper and it can be applied to various Internet applications relating to information retrieval as well as recommending Internet sites to visit. In addition, the invention of Breese can be used to make recommendations regarding graphical layouts, to find an email alias or to make a suggestion for an email alias to use (column 17 line 60 – column 18 line 2).

Claim 25:

Nazem discloses the elements of claims 19, 22 and 23.

Nazem teaches data including layout of the information sample (Figure 3, element 302), domain keyword of the information sample (column 2, line 67 and column 6, line 57), semantic category of the information sample (Figure 5A, element 504), and an event in the input (Figure 5A, element 504).

Nazem fails to disclose a computer program product that compares the domain keyword, semantic category, event and layout of the corresponding contents with those of the information sample to determine the degree of relevancy.

Breese shows a computer program product that compares the domain keyword, semantic category, event and layout of the corresponding contents with those of the information sample to determine the degree of relevancy (column 17, lines 60– 66).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Nazem to include a computer program product that compares the domain keyword, semantic category, event and layout of the corresponding contents with those of the information sample to determine the degree of relevancy according to Breese.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Nazem per the above for the purpose of having a search engine (database) perform a search wherein Breese generally teaches a broad application based on a search engine such as, e.g., a collaborative filter, to process data in a database. For example, the invention of Breese can be used to select data from a database to be included in a personalized electronic

newspaper and it can be applied to various Internet applications relating to information retrieval as well as recommending Internet sites to visit (column 17, lines 60– 66).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cheryl M Fernandes whose telephone number is (703) 305-3917. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on (703) 308-1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CMF  
April 5, 2004

  
SAFET METJAHIC  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100